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Related to globalization and the economic changes that have rapidly taken place in recent years has been a move toward closer rapprochement between academia and society in general and a greater involvement of universities in applied, policy-oriented social research. This trend can be expected to intensify in the future. In this process, the differences between purely academic and applied, policy-oriented research can and do become easily blurred. This article highlights the essential differences between the two types of research and points out how they can be supportive of each other, but concludes that for the benefit of both it is important that the boundaries between the two are maintained. It also claims that a relationship where there is close cooperation while boundaries are maintained is possible and meaningful only when certain broader societal values are pursued.

Parallèlement à la mondialisation et aux changements économiques qui se sont imposés rapidement au cours des dernières années, est apparu un mouvement en faveur d'un rapprochement plus étroit entre le monde universitaire et la société en général et une plus grande participation des universités dans la recherche sociale appliquée et axée sur les politiques publiques. Cette tendance devrait s'accroître à l'avenir. Dans ce processus, les différences entre la recherche purement universitaire et la recherche appliquée et axée sur les politiques publiques peuvent facilement s'embrouiller et de fait elles s'embrouillent. Cet article fait ressortir les différences essentielles entre ces deux types de recherche et montre comment elles peuvent s'appuyer l'une l'autre, mais conclut que pour le bénéfice des deux, il est important que les frontières entre elles soient maintenues. L'auteur indique également qu'il est possible d'établir une relation significative entre les deux types de recherche, lors qu'une étroite coopération existe et que les frontières sont maintenues, seulement si certaines valeurs sociétales plus vastes sont défendues.
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An indirect consequence of the globalization process that is rapidly taking place today has been a move toward a closer relationship between academia and those governmental agencies that formulate social policies. Academia, however, was conceived—both in the middle ages when it was established and in modern times—as an ivory tower, where the occupants' work has directly little to do with the marketplace and with the everyday life of the average citizen. Since the end of the 19th century, many philosophers have referred to this nature of the university (Newman, 1915; Maritain, 1943). Whitehead (1929), a philosopher of modernity, has pointed out that the spirit of generalization should dominate a university. According to him, well-planned university courses are studies of the "wide sweep of generality" in which concrete facts should be studied primarily as illustrations of general ideas. Habermas (1987), a critical theorist who in a tortuous way tried to combine the theoretical with the practical, yet avoid the "distortion" that practical interests bring into knowledge, concluded that in modern society the university remains the only social institution where one can still hope to conduct an intellectual discourse that is least distorted by political and practical interests. Yet today more and more universities concern themselves with the practical and political interests, and when it comes to research, the question arises as to whether indeed there is a basic difference between the general and universal and the particular and practical.

Is there indeed, and should there be, a basic difference between purely academic and applied, policy-oriented research? If there is or ought to be, then is it realistic to speak about bridging this difference or about any rapprochement between the two? My answer to these questions is, Yes, there is a basic difference between the two types of research, and Yes, it is realistic to talk about a closer rapprochement between the two. My basic principle in answering these questions is that in the long run academia must pay its dues to society. But while cooperating with the outside community as closely as possible, for the benefit of both, it must maintain and never lose sight of the basic difference and boundaries between the two that define their respective integrity.

To appreciate this principle in the context of the social change that is taking place today, let me look first at the "purely" academic research and then at the different types of policy-oriented research that academics may be involved with. The basic question that I would like to ask is how far can the applied, policy-related research done by academics move away from "purely" academic research and still retain its academic...
integrity? In this article I do not intend to answer this question by providing the final solution to the problem of the relationship between the academic and applied research. Neither do I intend to offer a review or an assessment of the extant applied research in immigration or ethnic studies as it relates to theoretical discipline objectives. The references to research used in the article are used only as illustrations of the points discussed. Rather, I would like this article to be a stimulus to thinking and discussion of the deeper issues involved. These are important issues, but their significance is easily lost in the hustle of activities of vying for research funds from agencies that need practical answers to practical problems and in meeting the deadlines for delivering research results.

The traditional ideologies behind academic research and applied research point to goals in different directions. As the academic ideology is commonly known in the universities, ideal academic research should aim to achieve knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Finding out truth and knowledge about social and historical reality is the end in itself. For applied research this is not the case. The ultimate end is resolution of social issues and solution of social problems. Furthermore, the aim of pure social science research is to generalize as much as possible for the sake of knowledge, but the aim of application is to specify as much as possible for the sake of practice. Although the former does not preclude the latter, the latter is not seen to be inherently part of the academic role as such. To some this may appear to be obvious and something that has been said before, yet to others it may be irrelevant, because universities are continually engaged in applied social research and in the future will be even more so. In real life the dividing line between academic and applied research may be blurred. Similarly, some researchers excel at doing both types of research. Still, to appreciate the relationship between academic research and practical social policy, one has to use ideal markers as the starting point for comparison.

Purely academic research can range from purely theoretical to purely descriptive research. Purely theoretical research can be the familiar armchair type of philosophizing. This is the type of research that has given theory a bad name, because it involves the researcher in making statements about empirical reality without assessing it in some empirically methodological manner. However, the idea of theory as a logical construction of a set of empirically testable propositions is an important and basic part of all science and an integral part of good scientific research. I should emphasize here that by a theory I mean analytical rather than
normative theory, that is, sets of propositions directed at assessing what is and why it is what it is, rather than determining what ought to be and what is the best way to achieve it. To the extent that social research presents a claim to be scientific, it must remain analytical. Normative theory, usually in the form of some ideology, is important. But it is not part of the scientific discipline as such, notwithstanding the fact that all pursuits of knowledge have some ideological underpinnings or implications.

"Purely" academic research is always theoretically relevant, that is, it is directed toward some broader theory. Theory is its point of orientation. Theory, however, is elusive. It is difficult to prove empirically, and there may be many theories that explain the same phenomenon. As a result, one can speak of levels of theoretical research. First is the level of non-empirical development of theory. This relies on two intellectual operations: logical reasoning and intuition. These two operations of the mind have sometimes been contrasted as opposites, because the former follows the rules of accepted logic and the latter does not. Yet for theory development, both are necessary. Rules of logic work once a proposition about some reality is asserted and accepted. But it is intuition that makes it possible to come up with completely new, original propositions.

Although these two operations are the basic tools of theory construction, they also become important tools of all research, including empirical research. Once a theory is taken up, academic logic requires that empirical research be undertaken to test it. However, this is easier said than done. As we know, theory testing cannot be done directly. Empirically, all theory can be tested only indirectly through testing specific hypotheses. Often these must be hypotheses that deal with very specific samples of evidence. More often than not, this means local, here-and-now samples from which it is hoped one could generalize. Much, or rather most, of academic social scientific research is made up exactly of this: testing specific—or very specific—hypotheses with limited, one-shot samples. At this point theory plays a basic role in academic research and academic research can and does meet policy-oriented research.

Much empirical social research tries to ascertain the factors that would make up the explanation of the issue studied. The classic cases are the studies that try to explain the ease of integration of immigrants into their host society. The researcher may single out such factors as educational and skill backgrounds of the immigrants, the length of stay in the country, age at arrival, intended occupation, value orientation, governmental policies, and so on. The problem is that it is rarely clear how all these
factors fit and function together, what degree of contribution is made by each, which is the most important, and which the least important factor. Many researchers resort to models to assess this. That is, they arrange the factors in what would be causal lines according to how strongly they statistically correlate with one another and how they would follow each other in a time sequence. The problem is that, statistical correlation notwithstanding, the connections between the different factors remain tenuous. Statistical correlation by itself shows that factors relate to one another, but it does not show how they flow or derive from one another. In other words, the lines of connection between factors thus singled out are more like the cars of a train, one pushing another without being hitched. Important and useful as it is, statistical correlation by itself does not provide the necessity of why one factor or a set of factors should be seen as a cause of another factor or a set of factors. Only theory can provide this sense of necessity and hence a genuine explanation.

In the example given above, the factors studied—education, skills, length of stay, and so forth—must be first seen as indicators of the phenomenon of integration as defined by a broader concept. As a rule, the scope of the broader concept reaches beyond the indicators studied. To be theoretically fruitful it must take into account potentially all aspects of integration, not only economic or political, but also social-psychological, cultural, historical, and other. Furthermore, the concept of integration must be related to the concept of community, because it is the subject and object of the process of integration. The notion of the community must thus take into account both: the broad community of the immigrants’ host society and the immigrants’ own ethnic community. This is necessary because the process of integration is not necessarily a zero-sum phenomenon where integration into the broad community is negatively related to participation in the ethnic community.

Most empirical studies that avoid embedding their work in a theoretical discussion of the community usually assume a simple formula by which immigrant integration is conceived as “doing as well or better” as/than the “average” members of society. To put it in elemental terms, averages for one or another category of immigrants or ethnic group, for example, income, education, and occupation, are compared with what is the average for the society as a whole. If these averages measure up, a positive conclusion is reached about integration. The problem with this conclusion is that it assumes several things that are not necessarily warranted by scientific logic. One is the narrow definition of integration.
that presumes that the general average is a satisfactory measure. This is a dubious assumption, especially because averages may hide lack of integration of the broader society itself. Comparing different ethnic communities with one another would be a more realistic approach, but this is not seen to be politically correct, as it can invite envy and stereotyping.

Furthermore, there is no scientific basis to assume that a set of objectively measured factors such as income, education, and so forth is also an indirect measure of the subjective factors such as the immigrants' satisfaction with living in the host community and the host community's satisfaction with living with the immigrant communities. The objective factors, although important in their own right, must always be evaluated in terms of how they relate to the subjective factors. The objective factor averages by themselves do not offer such evaluation.

Finally, the "doing or not doing as well" conclusion is not an analytical explanation. It is a value judgement. As such, it may be useful for policy-making, although it is debatable how useful it is for this purpose. Academically, however, it does not do what it is supposed to do, that is, offer a scientific explanation of the phenomenon. The latter must call on an analytical theory.

I have three more points about academic research. Much of academic research is simply descriptive rather than theoretical and explanatory. Many ethnographic types of studies describe specific ethnic group customs or institutions, and historical studies try to set out the histories of ethnic groups. But although we call them purely descriptive or purely historical, it should be remembered that they are theoretically relevant. Descriptive research presents facts that implicitly require explanation and so, as it were, beg a theory and sometimes hide a theory. Although not necessarily testing any theoretical hypothesis, such research helps to develop hypotheses and to develop theories.

Second, theory itself should not be seen as something that is not useful. Theory serves a variety of useful functions. It can guide investigation; it can generate new, creative ideas about a specific problem; it can organize the existing ideas about a specific problem and in doing so it may uncover hidden assumptions. Furthermore, it may show up the complexities of a problem; it may uncover what on the surface appears as no problem at all; or it can relate together what on the surface appear as different problems. It can also serve as a shorthand for communication (Cohen, 1989).

Finally, theoretical thinking itself has an important educational value
in creating a bond of understanding and cooperation among persons of different cultural and professional backgrounds. This is particularly valuable in the global context among persons of diverse backgrounds who are engaged in cooperative research. Research has shown that students of diverse cultural backgrounds who are exposed to the same theoretical framework are able to cooperate among themselves much more easily than those who are not.

This brings me to the question of policy-oriented research. Here we should keep in mind that unlike in the case of theory, all policy-related research has a normative rather than a purely analytical aim. Directly or indirectly it is involved with making value judgements. All action requires value judgements. Purely analytical research may also involve value judgements, but these tend to be methodological and abstract. The value judgements in applied research are completely different. They relate to real-life situations where community interests and individual interests are involved and may be competed for. They often imply ideologies that are shared by some socially based groups.

To throw more light on this question, I look again at the different types of policy-related research. Probably the type of policy-related social research most often done at the universities attempts to study specific problems in a way that would best indicate what decision to take regarding the problem. It may try to answer questions as to the number of immigrants that may be needed in the country to fill the labour demand in a specific occupation or how useful it is to require a certain number of years of education to admit immigrants into the country or, as suggested above, what type of immigrants do well occupationally or income-wise after arrival. Answers to these questions can feed directly into policy formation. Example of such studies are Reitz's (1998) studies of immigrants' occupational participation or Li's (2000) studies of self-employment by Chinese immigrants in Canada and many other similar studies. This may be the bread and butter of applied social research in universities.

An interesting type of policy-related research is exploratory research for future policy formation. An example of this are the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's reports of the 1960s (Canada, 1967-1969). The Commission offered grants for a large number of studies by various Canadian scholars who studied Quebec society, cultural contributions of ethnic communities, history of immigration policy in Canada, and the like. The focus of the studies was not specific, and so the scholars had much latitude in researching their topics. All these were to present a
picture of the ethnic relations situation in Canada on the basis of which the government could create policy. But bringing together the results into a coherent policy was very much determined by the value interests of the communities concerned.

The Spicer Commission's (1991) report presents references to a different kind of research. This is research aimed at policy assessment, in particular an assessment of multicultural policy. This kind of research is of a critical character. The fact-finding and references to scholarly research involved aimed to locate problems with the existing policy so that the policy could be amended or augmented. The research findings were used to change the direction of the policy.

The problem with policy-related research is that it can be easily used—and often is used—as a way of legitimizing preexisting policy conclusions, policy goals, or ideologies. Yet this may not be easily recognizable. It has been said that much research sponsored by the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism in its early phases was commissioned to justify the established policy of bilingualism and its foster-child, the policy of multiculturalism. Conversely, it has also been said that the Spicer Commission did its work to legitimize the previously expressed concerns and ideology of the conservative parties in Canada. Similarly, in the 1990s, much of the research on the economic adjustments of immigrants that tried to show how well immigrants had done can be said to have been undertaken to defuse the racist fear of the increased numbers of immigrants, especially those from the Orient.

Because policies are always connected with politics, commissioning or practically oriented research by public or private agencies can also take negative forms. Research can be commissioned to disprove alternative policies or to invalidate ideologies that are unacceptable to the commissioning body or simply to invalidate the findings of some other research. For example, recently it has been reported that the tobacco industry has been employing scientists to do research that would disprove the claims of the World Health Organization about the negative health results of smoking (Kaufman, 2000). Other cases can be pointed out, such as grants given to scholars by an ultraconservative group to produce research to show that some races are superior to others.

What, then, is the point of rapprochement between the academic and policy-related research, and why should there be an increasing need for it? The theoretical researchers have the general theoretical knowledge and methodological research skills as their intellectual resource. However, they need to focus on a specific problem and find some hypotheses
through which their theoretical knowledge can be tested. The policymakers or policy administrators, on the other hand, have practical knowledge as their intellectual resource, that is, experience with concrete cases of policy-making or administering and the problem-solving skills acquired through this experience. But as society becomes more complex, it is impossible and can be risky to offer rational solutions to complex problems based simply on experience.

It is here that academics, policy-makers, and administrators come together. They can satisfy their mutual needs. The policy-makers provide the academics with the specific problems for study, about which the academics can devise hypotheses that they need to fulfil their theoretical knowledge. In turn, the academics provide the policy-makers not merely with the research skills needed to study the specific practical problems, but the outside scientific justification and legitimation for the policy-makers' decisions. Above all, the academics' theories can guide policy decision-making.

I illustrate this through an issue in the United States that has recently become controversial. A study done by Peterson (2000) of Harvard University, commissioned by the Washington Scholarship Fund, compared a sample of 440 families of children who attended private schools with a sample of 1,400 families of children who attended public schools. The results, reminiscent of what Coleman (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987) found some 10 or more years ago in a similar study, showed that parents of the children attending private schools were overwhelmingly more satisfied with their children's school and performance than were the parents of children attending public schools. This finding is of particular relevance to minority immigrant parents. The question that these findings ask policy-makers is: Do these findings indicate that a policy of greater support of private schools should be undertaken? Maybe, but maybe not. A reasonable answer can be given to this is only when the policy-maker can place these findings into a broader context of a theory of institutional conditions of satisfactory school performance. And this is where the academics come in.

Another example is the research findings of economic studies of minorities that show that statistical analysis indicates that racism against native-born visible minorities is no longer a factor in the wage structure of the Canadian labour force (Hum & Simpson, 1999). If this is so, does it mean that we no longer need to have anti-racism policies? Obviously we cannot jump to this conclusion. Academic research in the social sciences often produces conflicting results. Other studies have shown
differences in income and levels of poverty between recent immigrants, particularly those of racial minorities, and the general population, indicating prejudice or racism (Harvey, Reil & Siu, 1999; Kazemipur & Halli, 2000). To develop policy that follows the findings of one or a few commissioned studies risks ignoring the research findings that show conflicting results. But to argue rationally for maintaining anti-racist policies, the policy-maker needs to have a broader theory of prejudice and racism that takes into account institutional, social-psychological factors, and periodic variation. And again, this is where the academics come in.

The need for cooperation between academia and the policy-makers will be progressively greater as the complexity of the global society rapidly evolves. The global society is driven by international corporations and by world-scopes computer and other technology. More and more research must be done in teams. It is less and less realistic for any agency to undertake scientific research on its own or to do it in-house. On the other hand, more and more university professors, especially the younger ones, are looking for funds for their research. This is particularly so, because the value of research at the universities is more and more measured by the amount of grant money researchers are able to bring in.

Furthermore, the question of the relationship between university research and social policy must be approached in the context of the changes that have been taking place in the relationship between the university and the governmental agencies and between the university and society in general. In both cases, previously defined barriers between the two are receding.

Future research done in universities must be seen in this context. Much of the natural sciences research at universities is done under contract or funded by grants from business communities. On the other hand, most of the social science research in Canada has in the past been funded by the government. However over the past 10 years or so, the nature of the relationship between government agencies and social science research has changed substantially and will probably change even more in the future. In the past, government agencies did not often specify the kind of research to be done. The broad areas of research may have been designated, but much leeway and choice as to the specific issues of study were left to the prospective researcher. More recently these areas have been narrowed down, and the university researcher must respond increasingly to the kinds of projects that government funding agencies
specify in the light of their policies. In other words, whereas in the past government agencies did most of their policy-related research in-house, recently more of this research is parceled out to the universities and to the private sector. The Metropolis Project is a good example of this change.

The narrowing of the focus of research funded by the government or other agencies introduces a dilemma for the academic researcher. That is, as the resources available for research increase, the choice of research preference becomes more restricted. Although more money is offered for social research, the researchers themselves have less say as to what is to be researched. There are no problem-free solutions to this dilemma. For young academic researchers who must prove themselves by attracting funds from outside the university, an easy way out is to “go with the flow” and choose research topics that funding agencies are interested in funding. By doing this, however, the researchers surrender their role of providing new directions in their field of study to the outside agencies. In the long run, this will have further implications for the university’s pursuit of general knowledge.

Another solution to this problem is probably what has for long been practiced by many academic social scientists who obtain outside funds for applied research aimed at answering specific needs of the funding agency. Researchers add their own objectives to those specified by the agency and thus fulfill their own preference as a by-product of the research. This has been a reasonable solution to the problem of narrowing of preferences. Still, it accords a secondary role to academic research in knowledge development and works to give academic research more of an applied rather than a theory-assessment-oriented character.

An alternative could be public research-granting policies that would support equally individual choice in research objectives and narrowly defined research objectives of benefit to specific agencies. In theory, this still remains one of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council’s (SSHRC) objectives, but in practice—in terms of the amount of funds offered and the emphasis placed on “strategic” team projects—it is the latter that holds priority. In the long run, broader funding for basic research may yield even better knowledge for policy formation than much of the narrowly defined research. The problem, of course, is that this approach requires a greater pool of resources and may fail to attract the interest of the practically oriented agencies. Still, with all these restrictions it is possible to establish a separate national research-funding agency that would support only basic research aimed at substantiating general social scientific theories and would allow maximum options for
individual research objectives.

Although an ideal solution to this problem may be difficult to achieve, in the circumstances the best solution must be a carefully articulated combination of all the possible alternatives.

Furthermore, in the past in Canada, unlike in the US, private enterprises and community organizations were much more indirectly involved in academia than they are today. In the 1990s, universities in Canada began to adopt aggressive policies of privatization. This has meant that substantial grants to universities have come from private sources. It has also meant an increased involvement of the private sector in academia, including a greater decision-making influence on university policies and programs. In the area of social research, this has taken the form of favoring applied social research and research of interest to communities outside of the university. This trend of outside involvement in the inner workings of the university and the outreach of the university community to outside communities will continue for some time.

The ivory tower walls between universities and society in general have also been coming down. In a recent article, Miller (2000), Professor of Higher Education at the University of Georgia, pointed out that the development of Internet-based distance education has removed higher education from the sole possession of traditional universities and placed it in the field of open competition. As an example we can point to Capella University; the University of Phoenix; Al-Quads Open University with headquarters in Jerusalem; the University of South Africa with 115,000 students; Anadolu University in Turkey with the largest student body in the world, over 500,000 students; and other virtual universities. Business communities themselves are already providing Internet-based education. They pay professors for their course content, package it, market it, and collect tuition fees from students—all without involving the universities. Examples are Harcourt Higher Education College and Barnes and Noble University. Traditional universities, however, are trying to catch up with the technology and are rapidly introducing more Internet-based courses to cater to the virtual rather than the in-person physical student. American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC) is an international association of 13 virtual universities and 60 other affiliated institutions, mainly established state universities and land grant colleges, established with the aim of cooperation in the field of distance education. Universities 21 is a corporation made up of 18 universities in 10 different countries that are in the process of establishing a global distance education system (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2000a). In Canada in the year 2000,
seven established universities have formed a consortium called Canadian Virtual University, which allows students to transfer credits easily from one to another member of the consortium (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2000b).

The prediction is that before too long the numbers of virtual students will far exceed the number of the physical students. Without doubt this will necessitate a new, more interactive structure of the relationship between the university and society in general.

In this continuing process of rapprochement between university-based social research and its outside sponsors will arise the question of rights to intellectual property and the ethics of patents. In the biological sciences we already have the practice of patenting genetically modified forms of higher life. The recent case of the OncoMice in which the Canadian Federal Court of Appeal ruled that this genetically modified variety of mice can be patented is a case in point. It gave new life to the debate over the question of whether, from the point of view of ethics, genetically modified forms of life can be privately owned by corporations or by individuals (Lawton, 2000). Analogously, I predict that soon the question will also arise of patenting social policies by the researchers whose research, empirical or otherwise, originated the idea of a particular social policy or made it possible to formulate the policy. We already have the issue of intellectual property and moral rights to intellectual property; and with the continuing process of privatization in global society we can expect that the issue of private ownership of public policies will also be raised. This may happen particularly in regard to those public policies that are profitable for private enterprise as, for example, the "special authorization" immigration programs. The result may be something that is paradoxical, yet has a logical basis, that is, privately owned public policy.

This brings me back to my original question about the boundaries between academic and practical research. In this rapid process of rapprochement between the two, the boundaries between them can be easily lost, and some may say that in many cases they already have disappeared. When this happens, I think academic research loses its integrity, and by the same token, the policy research loses its independent legitimacy. It is essential that academia never lose sight of its primary directive, that is, knowledge for the sake of knowledge. I argue that if in the long run academia is to pay its dues to society, in the short run it must retain its theoretical focus. In other words, when policy-related research is done, the academic must show what general knowledge this
research supports or fails to support. Failing to do this will only lend credibility to the criticism that policy-related research is meaningless because its conclusions are predetermined. I suggest that academics and policy-makers get together and write the basic principles of mutual cooperation—a kind of Magna Carta of academic and social policy research cooperation—that would both spell out what the two have in common and define the boundaries between them that must be maintained for mutual benefit. This kind of document will strongly legitimize cooperation between the two and give new impetus to fruitful research.

Finally, the rapprochement between theory and practice where there is close cooperation yet boundaries are kept is possible only when certain broader societal or cultural values are pursued and maintained. This is the lesson taught by much of the history of the 20th century. Both the Soviet and the Nazi experiences have clearly shown what happens when academic research is possible only if it is subordinated to the ideology of the state, which denies the value of independent academic pursuit and even the value of independent thinking. The loss of validity of such research under totalitarian regimes is well known. Conversely, the greatest steps in both theoretical social thinking and empirical social research were made in the 20th century in those countries where the values of democracy and independence of the academic and the political have been maintained in practice, at least to a significant degree. Yet in the year 2000 some scholars are warning the democratic West that free society should neither "ideify" itself excessively nor become completely pragmatic in its march toward globalization. As one scholar (Conquest, 1999) put it,

There is a smugness in 'Look at me being pragmatic.' But there are also dangers in the attitude ... 'Look at me being idealistic.' To congratulate oneself on one's warm commitment to the environment, or to peace, or to the oppressed, and think no more is a profound moral fault. The true conscience includes an intellectual conscience. (p. 201)

Important as they are, the practical and the technological by themselves do not develop or maintain a great society. The collapse of the Soviet Union revealed that the absolute primacy of the political and technological not only failed to develop a great society, but actually halted or stunted its development. Technology, commerce, and politics pay their
dues to society and contribute to its greatness when they operate within a broader value system that fosters both freedom and social commitment and yet is able to maintain limits on the demands of both. Whether the new global society will be able to live uniformly by such a value system remains to be seen. But academe must remain the important agent that fosters such values, beginning with themselves and their community co-researchers.

Notes


2 In the original presentation the difference of vision between the academic and the practical, policy-oriented research was illustrated by the following anecdote: An Army Company Commander and his First Sergeant were in the field. As they hit the sack for the night, the First Sergeant said: "Sir, look up into the sky and tell me what you see?" The Company Commander said, "I see millions of stars." Then 1st Sgt. asked: "And what does that tell you, sir?" The Company Commander said: "Astronomically, it tells me that there are millions of galaxies and potentially billions of planets. Theologically, it tells me that God is great and that we are small and insignificant. Meteorologically, it tells me that we will have a beautiful day tomorrow. What does it tell you, Sergeant?" And the 1st Sgt. said: "Well sir, it tells me that somebody stole our tent."

3 I use the word policy-maker to refer to persons who make decisions in regard to the choice of a policy. This differs from the concept of policy advisor. The latter refers to those who indicate the consequences of a variety of policy choices. Policy advisors become policymakers, or part of a team of policy-makers, if they decide on one policy alternative and accordingly advise those in power to put it into practice.
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